

MARK J. SALADINO County Counsel

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

TELEPHONE (213) 974-1861 FACSIMILE (213) 229-9924

February 18, 2015

TDD

(213) 633-0901

E-MAIL

pwu@counsel.lacounty.gov

TO:

PATRICK OGAWA

Acting Executive Officer Board of Supervisors

Attention: Agenda Preparation

FROM:

PATRICK A. WU

Senior Assistant County Counsel

Executive Office

RE:

Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda

County Claims Board Recommendation

Cheryl Aichele, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. United States District Court Case No. CV 12-10863

Attached is the Agenda entry for the Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation regarding the above-referenced matter. Also attached are the Case Summary and the Summary Corrective Action Plan to be made available to the public.

It is requested that this recommendation, the Case Summary, and the Summary Corrective Action Plan be placed on the Board of Supervisors' agenda.

PAW:cs

Attachments

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled <u>Cheryl Aichele</u>, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. United States District Court Case No. CV 12-10863, in the amount of \$225,000 and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This class action lawsuit alleges class members were unlawfully arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department during a protest movement, and subjected to lengthy bus detentions by the Sheriff's Department.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME

Cheryl Aichele, et al. v. County of

Los Ángeles, et al.

CASE NUMBER

CV 12-10863

COURT

United States District Court

DATE FILED

Complaint filed: December 20,

2012

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

Sheriff's Department

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

\$ 225,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

Barrett Litt

Kaye, McLane, Bednarski & Litt

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

Jonathan McCaverty

NATURE OF CASE

Plaintiff Cheryl Aichele, as class representative, alleges that she and other class members were wrongfully arrested by the LAPD during the Occupy LA protest on November 30, 2011, and subjected to lengthy bus detentions on Sheriff's Department buses causing pain and suffering.

The County denies the allegations; however, due to the risks and uncertainties of the litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigations costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$225,000 is recommended.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

\$ 125,838

PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 637

Case Name: Cheryl Aichele, et al. County of Los Angeles, et al.

Summary Corrective Action Plan



The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Wednesday, November 30, 2011
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Cheryl Aichele, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2014-042
	On Wednesday. November 30, 2011, members of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Court Services Transportation Bureau were requested by members of the Los Angeles Police Department to transport a large number of protestors from Los Angeles City Hall to various Los Angeles Police Department facilities for booking. A total of six passenger busses were used to transport approximately 246 individuals. ¹
	The first two Sheriff's Department passenger busses were successfully offloaded at the Los Angeles Police Department's Parker Center. The remaining four busses could not be offloaded because Parker Center had reached its capacity. A representative from the Los Angeles Police Department directed the four remaining Sheriff's Department passenger busses to the Los Angeles Police Department's Van Nuys Station jail.
	At the Van Nuys Station jail, space considerations would permit the offloading of just two of the four passenger busses. After a considerable delay, the remaining two passenger busses were directed to return to the Los Angeles Police Department's Parker Center where the remaining passengers were finally offloaded.

Briefly describe the <u>root cause(s)</u> of the claim/lawsuit;

The root cause in this incident would appear to be a lack of communication between the Los Angeles Police Department's incident command post, other Department officials, and the Department's Valley Services Detention Center watch commander. This lack of communication caused an unreasonable delay in the booking and/or processing of the individuals affected.

This section intentionally left blank.

Page 1 of 3

Document version: 4.0 (January 2013)

¹ The 246 individuals were arrested by officers from the Los Angeles Police Department during the 2011 Occupy LA demonstration outside Los Angeles City Hall. Of the 246, only 126 of the individuals were directly affected by this incident.

 Briefly describe recommended corrective actions: (Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of the incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum addresses the circumstances which occurred in the incident.

This incident was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Court Services Transportation Bureau. Their investigation found a lack of communication between the Los Angeles Police Department's incident command post, other Department officials, and the Department's Valley Services Detention Center watch commander caused an unreasonable delay in the booking and/or processing of the individuals affected.

No misconduct on the part of any Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department employee is suspected. Consequently, no personnel-related administrative action was taken.

While no systemic issues were identified, several corrective measures are being taken to address the issues raised by the plaintiffs in order to preclude a recurrence:

- On or before January 30, 2015, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Risk Managment Bureau's will initiate a revision to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Manual of Policy and Procedures section 3-01/110.24, Use of Flex-Cuffs, to require employees engaged in the transportation of individuals confined in flex-cuffs to have readily available a flex-cuff removal tool;²
- On or before January 30, 2015, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Risk Management Bureau will revise Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Field Operations Support Services Newsletter Volume 05, Number 08, Flex-Cuffs, to require to require employees engaged in the transportation of individuals confined in flex-cuffs to have readily available a flex-cuff removal tool;³
- Upon closer review, it was determined that no specific policy, procedure, or protocol addressing lengthy detentions aboard a Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department passenger bus exists. Consequently, in order to preclude a recurrence, on or before March 27, 2015, personnel from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Court Services Transportation Bureau will develop and implement a unit order to address lengthy detentions while a passenger aboard a Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department passenger bus; and,

Finally, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Risk Managment Bureau will refer this case (i.e., the application and removal of flex-cuffs, etc.) to the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Training Bureau for their consideration.

- 3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?
 - ☐ Yes The corrective actions address department-wide system issues.
 - ☑ No The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Page 2 of 3

² Currently, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Manual of Policy and Procedures section 3-01/110.24, Use of Flex-Cuffs, requires "(D)ike-type cutters shall be available at all Station and facilities that utilize flex-cuffs."

³ To be reconciled and consistent with Manual of Policy and Procedures section 3-01/110.24, Use of Flex-

Patrick Hunter, A	gement Coordinator) Acting Captain			
Risk Manageme)		
Signature:	// //		, Date:	
1			:	,
MAAD	WAN VO		12/28	/14
			an carried of the control of the con	typenkaring a line knows in the American
Name: (Departmen	t Head)		•	
Earl M. Shields, Professional Sta	Chief ^r ndards Division			
Signature:		and the second of the second o	Date:	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.
Control of the contro	- M.	211	12/2	3/14
6	end M.	AU.	12/2	13/14
Chilaf Evacutiva	Office Rigk Mans		The second secon	13/14
		agement Inspector G	eneral USE ONLY	13/14
Are the correctly	e actions applicabl	agement Inspector Goles	eneral USE ONLY s within the County?	13/14
Are the corrective	e actions applicabl	agement Inspector Go le to other departments hs potentially have Cou	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	23/14
Are the corrective	e actions applicabl	agement Inspector Goles	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	13/14
Are the corrective Yes, the No, the	e actions applicable corrective actions	agement Inspector Go le to other departments as potentially have Cou s are applicable only to	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	93/14
Are the corrective Yes, the No, the Name: (Risk Manage	e actions applicable corrective actions corrective actions gement inspector General corrections actions action	agement Inspector Go le to other departments his potentially have Cou is are applicable only to eral)	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	23/14
Are the corrective Yes, the No, the Name: (Risk Manage	e actions applicable corrective actions corrective actions gement inspector General corrections actions action	agement Inspector Go le to other departments his potentially have Cou is are applicable only to eral)	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	23/14
Are the corrective Yes, the No, the Name: (Risk Manage)	e actions applicable corrective actions	agement Inspector Go le to other departments his potentially have Cou is are applicable only to eral)	eneral USE ONLY within the County? unty-wide applicability.	23/14
Are the corrective Yes, the No, the Name: (Risk Manage	e actions applicable corrective actions corrective actions gement inspector General corrections actions action	agement Inspector Go le to other departments his potentially have Cou is are applicable only to eral)	eneral USE ONLY s within the County? Inty-wide applicability. Ithis department.	03/14